UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/557,739	04/25/2000	KEVIN B. GJERSTAD	1018.099US1	9937

5251 7590 03/26/2004

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP
2555 GRAND BLVD
KANSAS CITY,, MO 64108

EXAMINER	
SMITH, PETER J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	8

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/557,739	GJERSTAD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 February 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10 and 12-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 April 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 2/5/2004, application filed on 4/25/2000.

2. Claims 1-10 and 12-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 9, and 20 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 5/10/1996 in view of Tung et al. (hereafter referred to as Tung), US 5,511,193 published 4/23/1996.

Regarding independent claim 1, Saunders teaches an application program owning a document in fig. 1 and 3. Saunders teaches a plurality of input device handlers, each handler having a corresponding input device and capable of entering text into the document in fig. 1 and col. 1 line 66 – col. 2 line 5. Saunders teaches a handler which returns correction content for display by an application program itself for text specified by the application program that was entered into a document by the handler in fig. 5, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-51. Saunders teaches a handler which displays a correction interface thereof for correction of text

specified by the application program that was entered into a document by the handler in fig. 4, 5, col. 2 lines 30-51, and col. 6 lines 11-67.

Saunders teaches a mechanism to associate each handler with a specified portion of text in a document in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 6 lines 11-67. The reservation feature of Saunders denies access to a specified region of text by other text handlers. Saunders does not teach a mechanism to track initial entry of each specified portion of text into a document by each handler. Tung teaches the creation and use of TSM documents to allow for multiple instances of a particular input method and to automatically synchronize the TSM documents to active text input areas in fig. 4, the abstract and col. 2 line 51 – col. 3 line 7.

Saunders teaches a correction interface callable by an application program after initial entry of the specified text into a document, to determine a responsible handler in fig. 4, col. 1 lines 55-65, col. 2 lines 6-16 and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders does not teach that the responsible handler necessarily initially entered the specified text portion and where the responsible handler is determined based on a tracking mechanism. Saunders does teach that a specified portion of text may be reserved by a unique identifier so that only a handler matched to the unique identifier may be able to implement a text service or manipulation upon the specified portion of text. Tung teaches the creation and use of TSM documents to allow for multiple instances of a particular input method and to automatically synchronize the TSM documents to active text input areas in fig. 4, the abstract and col. 2 line 51 – col. 3 line 7.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tung into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the TSM document feature of Tung to have

modified the reserved specified text feature of Saunders so that the original text handler initially creating the specified portion of text would have solely had the ability to have performed a text service or manipulation upon the specified text through use of the unique identifier. The unique identifier would have denied access to other text input handlers as taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67. The TSM document feature incorporated from Tung would have actively coupled the input method of a particular text input handler to a reserved specified region of text as long as the TSM document instance existed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the reservation of specified text regions to certain text input handlers so that the text could have been consistently manipulated by the user of the multiple text input devices.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Saunders teaches an application program which calls the method of an input device to request at least that the responsible handler return the correction content such that the application program manages correction of the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 16-51.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Saunders teaches an application program which calls the method of the responsible handler to request at least that the handler display a correction interface thereof such that the handler manages correction of the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 16-51.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Saunders teaches a mechanism to track entry of text into a document by each handler associates each contiguous range of text entered into the document by a single handler to the single handler in fig. 5 and col. 2 lines 17-39.

Regarding independent claim 6, Saunders teaches a mechanism to associate each handler with a specified portion of text in a document in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and

col. 6 lines 11-67. The reservation feature of Saunders denies access to a specified region of text by other text handlers. Saunders does not teach a mechanism to track initial entry of each specified portion of text into a document by each handler. Tung teaches the creation and use of TSM documents to allow for multiple instances of a particular input method and to automatically synchronize the TSM documents to active text input areas in fig. 4, the abstract and col. 2 line 51 – col. 3 line 7.

Saunders teaches a correction interface callable by an application program after initial entry of the specified text into a document, to determine a responsible handler in fig. 4, col. 1 lines 55-65, col. 2 lines 6-16 and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders does not teach that the responsible handler necessarily initially entered the specified text portion and where the responsible handler is determined based on a tracking mechanism. Saunders does teach that a specified portion of text may be reserved by a unique identifier so that only a handler matched to the unique identifier may be able to implement a text service or manipulation upon the specified portion of text. Tung teaches the creation and use of TSM documents to allow for multiple instances of a particular input method and to automatically synchronize the TSM documents to active text input areas in fig. 4, the abstract and col. 2 line 51 – col. 3 line 7.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tung into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the TSM document feature of Tung to have modified the reserved specified text feature of Saunders so that the original text handler initially creating the specified portion of text would have solely had the ability to have performed a text service or manipulation upon the specified text through use of the unique identifier. The unique

identifier would have denied access to other text input handlers as taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67. The TSM document feature incorporated from Tung would have actively coupled the input method of a particular text input handler to a reserved specified region of text as long as the TSM document instance existed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the reservation of specified text regions to certain text input handlers so that the text could have been consistently manipulated by the user of the multiple text input devices.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Saunders teaches a mechanism which associates each contiguous range of text entered into the document by a single handler to the single handler in fig. 5 and col. 2 lines 17-39.

Regarding independent claim 9, Saunders teaches entering text into a document owned by an application by a handler for an input device, via a common text framework governing interaction between the application and the handler for the input device, such that the application exposes the document as an abstraction in fig. 1, 4, col. 1 lines 55-65 and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders teaches a mechanism to associate each handler with a specified portion of text in a document in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 6 lines 11-67. The reservation feature of Saunders denies access to a specified region of text by other text handlers. Saunders does not teach a mechanism to track initial entry of each specified portion of text into a document by each handler. Tung teaches the creation and use of TSM documents to allow for multiple instances of a particular input method and to automatically synchronize the TSM documents to active text input areas in fig. 4, the abstract and col. 2 line 51 – col. 3 line 7.

Saunders teaches a correction interface callable by an application program after initial entry of the specified text into a document, to determine a responsible handler in fig. 4, col. 1

lines 55-65, col. 2 lines 6-16 and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders does not teach that the responsible handler necessarily initially entered the specified text portion and where the responsible handler is determined based on a tracking mechanism. Saunders does teach that a specified portion of text may be reserved by a unique identifier so that only a handler matched to the unique identifier may be able to implement a text service or manipulation upon the specified portion of text. Tung teaches the creation and use of TSM documents to allow for multiple instances of a particular input method and to automatically synchronize the TSM documents to active text input areas in fig. 4, the abstract and col. 2 line 51 – col. 3 line 7.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tung into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the TSM document feature of Tung to have modified the reserved specified text feature of Saunders so that the original text handler initially creating the specified portion of text would have solely had the ability to have performed a text service or manipulation upon the specified text through use of the unique identifier. The unique identifier would have denied access to other text input handlers as taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67. The TSM document feature incorporated from Tung would have actively coupled the input method of a particular text input handler to a reserved specified region of text as long as the TSM document instance existed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the reservation of specified text regions to certain text input handlers so that the text could have been consistently manipulated by the user of the multiple text input devices.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Saunders teaches requesting the identity of the particular handler responsible for entering specified text into a specified range of the document in fig. 4a, 4b, 5, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-40.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Saunders teaches requesting by the application of the particular handler to return correction content for the specified text for display by the application itself in fig. 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-16. Saunders teaches returning by the particular handler to the application the correction content for the specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Saunders teaches displaying by the application of the correction content in col. 2 lines 30-51.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Saunders teaches an application which manages corrections to the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Saunders teaches requesting by the application of a particular handler that the particular handler display a correction interface thereof for correction of the specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-30. Saunders teaches displaying by a particular handler of the correction interface in fig. 4a, 4b, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Saunders teaches a particular handler which manages corrections to the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Saunders teaches requesting by the application of a particular handler that the particular handler display a correction interface thereof for correction of the specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-16. Saunders teaches displaying by a particular handler of a correction interface in fig. 4a, 4b, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Saunders teaches a particular handler which manages corrections to the specified text itself in col. 2 lines 6-51.

Regarding independent claim 20, Saunders teaches entering text into a document owned by an application by a handler for an input device, via a common text framework governing interaction between the application and the handler for the input device, such that the application exposes the document as an abstraction in fig. 1 and col. 1 lines 55-65. Saunders teaches a handler which returns correction content for display by the application itself for a specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 2 lines 6-16. Saunders teaches a handler which displays a correction interface thereof for correction of a specified text in fig. 4a, 4b, and col. 2 lines 6-51.

Saunders teaches associating each handler with a specified portion of text in a document in fig. 1, 4a, 4b, col. 1 lines 55-65, and col. 6 lines 11-67. The reservation feature of Saunders denies access to a specified region of text by other text handlers. Saunders does not teach tracking the initial entry of each specified portion of text into a document by each handler. Tung teaches the creation and use of TSM documents to allow for multiple instances of a particular input method and to automatically synchronize the TSM documents to active text input areas in fig. 4, the abstract and col. 2 line 51 – col. 3 line 7.

Saunders teaches a correction interface callable by an application program after initial entry of the specified text into a document, to determine a responsible handler in fig. 4, col. 1 lines 55-65, col. 2 lines 6-16 and col. 4 line 59 – col. 5 line 9. Saunders does not teach that the responsible handler necessarily initially entered the specified text portion and where the responsible handler is determined based on a tracking mechanism. Saunders does teach that a

specified portion of text may be reserved by a unique identifier so that only a handler matched to the unique identifier may be able to implement a text service or manipulation upon the specified portion of text. Tung teaches the creation and use of TSM documents to allow for multiple instances of a particular input method and to automatically synchronize the TSM documents to active text input areas in fig. 4, the abstract and col. 2 line 51 – col. 3 line 7.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Tung into Saunders to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the TSM document feature of Tung to have modified the reserved specified text feature of Saunders so that the original text handler initially creating the specified portion of text would have solely had the ability to have performed a text service or manipulation upon the specified text through use of the unique identifier. The unique identifier would have denied access to other text input handlers as taught by Saunders in col. 6 line 55-67. The TSM document feature incorporated from Tung would have actively coupled the input method of a particular text input handler to a reserved specified region of text as long as the TSM document instance existed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have maintained the reservation of specified text regions to certain text input handlers so that the text could have been consistently manipulated by the user of the multiple text input devices.

5. Claims 5, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saunders, US 5,946,499 filed 5/10/1996 in view of Tung et al. (hereafter referred to as Tung), US 5,511,193 published 4/23/1996 as applied to claims 4, 7, and 9 above, and further

in view of Covington et al. (hereafter referred to as Covington), US 5,524,193 published 6/4/1996.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Saunders teaches identifying a single handler for a contiguous range of text in fig. 4a, 4b, and 5. Saunders does not teach attaching a property to a contiguous range of text. Covington does teach attaching a property to a contiguous range of text in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Saunders so that a property could be attached to a range of text so that the mechanism could accommodate a more diverse group of documents. This would have been a beneficial improvement since most documents are not solely composed of textual elements, but rather have other properties incorporated in their definition.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Saunders teaches identifying a single handler for a contiguous range of text in fig. 4a, 4b, and 5. Saunders does not teach attaching a property to a contiguous range of text. Covington does teach attaching a property to a contiguous range of text in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Saunders so that a property could be attached to a range of text so that the mechanism could accommodate a more diverse group of documents. This would have been a beneficial improvement since most documents are not solely composed of textual elements, but rather have other properties incorporated in their definition.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Saunders teaches identifying a range of text in a document in fig. 4a, 4b, and 5. Saunders does not teach attaching a property to a range of the document corresponding to the text entered. Covington does teach attaching a property to a range of the document corresponding to the text entered in the abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Covington into Saunders to create the invention as claimed. It would have been obvious and desirable to have modified Saunders so that a property could be attached to a range of text so that the mechanism could accommodate a more diverse group of documents. This would have been a beneficial improvement since most documents are not solely composed of textual elements, but rather have other properties incorporated in their definition.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 2/5/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments in page 8-11 that Saunders does not disclose or teach either a tracking mechanism to track the initial entry of each specified portion of text into the document by each handler or a correction interface that determines and calls upon the handler initially responsible for entering the text, the Examiner has additionally cited the reference of Tung et al. (hereafter referred to as Tung) which the Examiner believes in combination with Saunders renders the amended claimed invention obvious.

Saunders teaches an ability to reserve a specified portion of text with a unique identifier in fig. 4,5, and col. 6 lines 11-67. The Examiner's understanding is that this reserved portion of text is uniquely matched to a specific text input handler and a text service or manipulation may

only be performed upon the specified text area via the uniquely matched text input handler. Saunders does not teach that the uniquely matched text input handler was necessarily the text input handler which initially entered the text to form the specified text area. However, Tung teaches the use of a TSM document to provide multiple instances of a particular text input method and automatically synchronize each of these instances to an active text input area. This essentially tracks the original input of a specified portion of text to a specific text input handler.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the synchronized tracking of Tung with the reserved specified text feature of Saunders to have created the claimed invention. The text input handler which originated a particular specified text would have been known using this combination and future text services and manipulations performed upon this specified region of text would have been uniquely reserved to have been performed by the same original text input handler.

Applicant's arguments regarding these two features is that they patentably distinguish independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 20 from the prior art and likewise depending claims 2-5, 7-8, 10, and 12-19 are subsequently patentably distinct. The Examiner believes that the combination of Saunders and Tung render independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 20 and dependent claims 2-4, 7-8, and 12-19 obvious and the combination of Saunders, Tung and Covington render dependent claims 5, 8 and 10 obvious.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 703-305-5931. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
March 24, 2004

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER